

## **STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT**

## Question 1

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they use content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in four subject areas, by school characteristics

**Table 1A - Title I Status**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	All Schools (N=1,249)	Non-Title I (N=482)	Title I (N=767)	All Schools (N=1,249)	Non-Title I (N=482)	Title I (N=767)	All Schools (N=1,249)	Non-Title I (N=482)	Title I (N=767)	All Schools (N=1,249)	Non-Title I (N=482)	Title I (N=767)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	<1	<1	<1	4	4	5	23	25	21	72	70	74
Mathematics	1	<1	1	5	4	5	22	25	21	72	71	73
Science	2	2	2	8	7	8	29	29	29	61	62	60
History/Social Studies	3	2	3	11	9	12	30	30	29	57	58	56

**Table 1B - School Type**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Non-Title I (N=482)	SW (N=445)	TA (N=322)	Non-Title I (N=482)	SW (N=445)	TA (N=322)	Non-Title I (N=482)	SW (N=445)	TA (N=322)	Non-Title I (N=482)	SW (N=445)	TA (N=322)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	<1	1	<1	4	3	6	25	18	24	70	79	70
Mathematics	<1	1	1	4	4	6	25	18	23	71	77	70
Science	2	2	3	7	8	8	29	30	29	62	60	60
History/Social Studies	2	3	3	9	12	11	30	28	30	58	56	55

**Table 1C - Minority Enrollment**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	0-49.9% (N=600)	50-79.9% (N=344)	80-100% (N=305)	0-49.9% (N=600)	50-79.9% (N=344)	80-100% (N=305)	0-49.9% (N=600)	50-79.9% (N=344)	80-100% (N=305)	0-49.9% (N=600)	50-79.9% (N=344)	80-100% (N=305)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	<1	1	1	4	4	4	24	20	22	71	76	72
Mathematics	<1	1	1	5	4	5	24	18	21	71	76	72
Science	1	4	3	7	12	7	30	26	30	62	58	60
History/Social Studies	2	5	5	9	13	13	31	28	29	58	54	53

Question 1 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they use content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in four subject areas, by school characteristics

Table 1D - School Level

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Elemen- tary (N=545)	Middle (N=332)	High (N=314)	Elemen- tary (N=545)	Middle (N=332)	High (N=314)	Elemen- tary (N=545)	Middle (N=332)	High (N=314)	Elemen- tary (N=545)	Middle (N=332)	High (N=314)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading <sup>a</sup>	<1	1	1	5	2	6	21	22	31*	74	75*	62*
Mathematics	<1	1	1	5	2	6	20	25	28	74	72	65
Science	2	1	3	8	5	10	29	28	32	60	66	56
History/Social Studies	3	2	3	12	8	9	30	27	32	55	62	56

Table 1E - Metropolitan Status

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Central City of MSA (N=418)	MSA not Central City (N=344)	Not MSA (N=487)	Central City of MSA (N=418)	MSA not Central City (N=344)	Not MSA (N=487)	Central City of MSA (N=418)	MSA not Central City (N=344)	Not MSA (N=487)	Central City of MSA (N=418)	MSA not Central City (N=344)	Not MSA (N=487)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	<1	1	<1	3	4	5	22	20	26	75	75	69
Mathematics	<1	<1	1	4	3	6	21	22	24	74	75	69
Science	1	2	3	9	7	8	31	24	32	60	67	58
History/Social Studies	2	3	3	14	10	10	28	29	31	57	58	55

Table 1F - Poverty Level

	Not at All				Small Extent			
	0-34.9% (N=401)	35-49.9% (N=198)	50-74.9% (N=320)	75-100% (N=316)	0-34.9% (N=401)	35-49.9% (N=198)	50-74.9% (N=320)	75-100% (N=316)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	<1	<1	<1	1	5	2	3	6
Mathematics	<1	<1	1	1	5	4	4	6
Science	1	2	3	3	7	6	12	8
History/Social Studies	1	3	5	5	11	7	14	12

**Question 1 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they use content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in four subject areas, by school characteristics**

**Table 1F - Poverty Level (continued)**

	<b>Moderate Extent</b>				<b>Great Extent</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=401)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=198)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=320)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=316)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=401)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=198)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=320)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=316)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	23	29	22	16	71	68	75	77
Mathematics	24	26	19	17	71	70	75	76
Science	29	33	29	28	63	59	56	62
History/Social Studies	30	33	30	24	58	57	51	59

**Table 1G - School Size**

	<b>Not at All</b>				<b>Small Extent</b>			
	<b>Less than 300 (N=172)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=292)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=490)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=295)</b>	<b>Less than 300 (N=172)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=292)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=490)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=295)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	<1	<1	<1	1	7	4	3	2
Mathematics <sup>b</sup>	1	<1	1	0	8	4	3	1
Science	4	2	2	<1	9	8	8	4
History/Social Studies	5	2	2	<1	13	12	9	5

**Table 1G - School Size (continued)**

	<b>Moderate Extent</b>				<b>Great Extent</b>			
	<b>Less than 300 (N=172)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=292)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=490)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=295)</b>	<b>Less than 300 (N=172)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=292)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=490)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=295)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Reading	29	20	21	25	63	75	76	72
Mathematics <sup>b</sup>	26	19	22	24	64	76	74	75
Science	33	29	28	26	55	61	62	70
History/Social Studies	31	29	30	29	51	56	58	65

## Question 2

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent content standards for any subject have changed in the last year, by school characteristics

**Table 2A - Title I Status<sup>b</sup>**

	<b>All Schools (N=1,237)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=478)</b>	<b>Title I (N=759)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	9	9	10
Small extent	24	23	24
Moderate extent	42	45	39
Great extent	25	23	27
No content standards	<1	0	<1

**Table 2B - School Type<sup>b</sup>**

	<b>Non-Title I (N=478)</b>	<b>SW (N=439)</b>	<b>TA (N=320)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	9	12	8
Small extent	23	17	29
Moderate extent	45	44	36
Great extent	23	27	27
No content standards	0	1	<1

**Table 2C - Minority Enrollment<sup>a</sup>**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=599)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=339)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=299)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	7	12	13*
Small extent	25	18	24
Moderate extent	45	40	32*
Great extent	23	29	29
No content standards	<1	<1	1

**Question 2 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent content standards for any subject have changed in the last year, by school characteristics**

**Table 2D - School Level<sup>b</sup>**

	<b>Elementary (N=540)</b>	<b>Middle (N=329)</b>	<b>High (N=313)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	10	6	10
Small extent	23	25	24
Moderate extent	40	44	47
Great extent	27	24	19
No content standards	<1	<1	0

**Table 2E - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City of MSA (N=413)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=341)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=483)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	9	10	9
Small extent	24	16	28
Moderate extent	42	44	40
Great extent	24	30	23
No content standards	<1	<1	<1

**Table 2F - Poverty Level<sup>b</sup>**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=397)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=200)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=316)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	7	9	11	16
Small extent	24	29	18	24
Moderate extent	47	38	40	33
Great extent	22	24	32	26
No content standards	0	<1	0	1

**Question 2 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent content standards for any subject have changed in the last year, by school characteristics**

**Table 2G - School Size<sup>b</sup>**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=172)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=291)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=480)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=294)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Not at all	8	13	7	8
Small extent	27	25	21	23
Moderate extent	43	41	41	46
Great extent	22	21	31	23
No content standards	0	<1	<1	0

### Question 3

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent the following are barriers to applying high standards, by school characteristics

**Table 3A - Title I Status**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	All schools (N=1234)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=758)	All schools (N=1234)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=758)	All schools (N=1234)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=758)	All schools (N=1234)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=758)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	42	40	44	37	38	37	17	19	16	3	3	3
Inadequacy of parent involvement	21	26*	17	33	36	30	33	29*	36	13	9*	17
Outdated technology	28	30	27	36	35	37	26	26	26	9	10	9
High student mobility	26	34*	20	39	38	39	24	22	25	12	6*	17
Diversity of student populations	33	38*	29	39	41	37	22	17*	25	7	5*	8
Language barriers	55	59	53	31	33	29	9	7*	11	5	1*	7
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	28	28	27	35	35	36	26	25	27	11	13	10

**Table 3B - School Type**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=440)	TA (N=318)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=440)	TA (N=318)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=440)	TA (N=318)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=440)	TA (N=318)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	40	46	42	38	32	41	19	19	14	3	4	3
Inadequacy of parent involvement	26*	12*	22	36	29	31	29*	37	34	9*	21*	13
Outdated technology	30	21	32	35	40	35	26	26	26	10	12	6
High student mobility	34*	10*	28	38	38	39	22	29*	21	6*	22*	12*
Diversity of student populations	38*	26	31	41	36	38	17*	29*	22	5	8	9*
Language barriers	59*	46*	58	33	27	31	7*	17*	7	1*	10*	5*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	28	28	27	35	35	36	25	27	27	13	9	11



Question 3 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent the following are barriers to applying high standards, by school characteristics

Table 3C - Minority Enrollment

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	0-49.9% (N=596)	50-79.9% (N=337)	80-100% (N=301)	0-49.9% (N=596)	50-79.9% (N=337)	80-100% (N=301)	0-49.9% (N=596)	50-79.9% (N=337)	80-100% (N=301)	0-49.9% (N=596)	50-79.9% (N=337)	80-100% (N=301)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	41	46	40	40	33	31	16	17	25	3	4	4
Inadequacy of parent involvement	26*	8*	18	37	30*	20*	29*	40	39*	8*	23	22*
Outdated technology	33*	21	20*	34	40	39	25	27	31	9	12	10
High student mobility	32*	13	15*	40	38	36	21*	30	27	8*	19	22*
Diversity of student populations	35*	24	33	41	37	32*	18*	27	28*	5*	13*	7
Language barriers	59*	47	51	33	29	22*	6*	15	16*	2*	9	11*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	27	25	31	35	40	31	27	25	24	11	10	13

Table 3D - School Level

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Elementary (N=539)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=312)	Elementary (N=539)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=312)	Elementary (N=539)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=312)	Elementary (N=539)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=312)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	44	44*	32*	37	38	40	16	16	21	2	2*	8*
Inadequacy of parent involvement	22	18	21	33	30	34	31	37	35	14	15	10
Outdated technology	30	26	27	36	35	38	26	25	27	9	13	8
High student mobility	24	27	30	39	33	42	24	25	20	13	15	8
Diversity of student populations	32	28*	41*	37	41	41	23	23*	14*	8	8*	4*
Language barriers	53	50*	65*	30	38*	27	11	8*	5*	6	4	2*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	28	30	24	35	37	34	26	22	33	12	11	9

**Question 3 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent the following are barriers to applying high standards, by school characteristics**

**Table 3E - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Not at All</b>			<b>Small Extent</b>			<b>Moderate Extent</b>			<b>Great Extent</b>		
	<b>Central City of MSA (N=412)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=338)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=484)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=412)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=338)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=484)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=412)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=338)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=484)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=412)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=338)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=484)</b>
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	% 43	% 47	% 38	% 35	% 34	% 41	% 18	% 16	% 17	% 4	% 2	% 4
Inadequacy of parent involvement	12*	31*	20*	31	32	34	36*	27	35	21*	10	11*
Outdated technology	25	34	27	34	38	37	28	22	28	14	6	9
High student mobility	14*	32	28*	30	37	45*	36*	19	19*	21*	12	7*
Diversity of student populations	29	33	35	36	39	40	24	21	20	10	7	5
Language barriers	41	48*	69*	34	37*	24*	17*	10*	5*	8	5*	2*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	27	23*	31	37	35	34	20*	29	27*	16	13	7*

**Question 3 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent the following are barriers to applying high standards, by school characteristics**

**Table 3F - Poverty Level**

	Not at All				Small Extent			
	0-34.9% (N=395)	35-49.9% (N=199)	50-74.9% (N=313)	75-100% (N=313)	0-34.9% (N=395)	35-49.9% (N=199)	50-74.9% (N=313)	75-100% (N=313)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	41	40	44	47	39	45	36	27
Inadequacy of parent involvement	33*+	12	7	12*	38+	32+	28	20*
Outdated technology	33+	31*	19	22*	36	31	42	36
High student mobility	38*+	21+	14	6*	41	35	36	38
Diversity of student populations	40*+	27	24	26*	42	38	34	36
Language barriers <sup>a</sup>	62+	56*	44	48*	33	32	30*	22*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	28	27	23	33	36	35	40	29

**Table 3F - Poverty Level (continued)**

	Moderate Extent				Great Extent			
	0-34.9% (N=395)	35-49.9% (N=199)	50-74.9% (N=313)	75-100% (N=313)	0-34.9% (N=395)	35-49.9% (N=199)	50-74.9% (N=313)	75-100% (N=313)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	16	13	18	22	4	2	2	4
Inadequacy of parent involvement	24*+	44	42	39*	5*+	12*+	23	29*
Outdated technology	23	29	28	29	8	9	11	13
High student mobility	16*+	32	31	30*	5*+	12+	19	25*
Diversity of student populations	14*+	29	27	30*	4+	6*	15	8
Language barriers <sup>a</sup>	4+	9	16	18*	1+	4*+	10	12*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	25	27	27	26	11	11	9	12

**Question 3 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent the following are barriers to applying high standards, by school characteristics**

**Table 3G - School Size**

	<b>Not at All</b>				<b>Small Extent</b>			
	<b>Less than 300 (N=168)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=291)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=482)</b>	<b>1000 or more (N=293)</b>	<b>Less than 300 (N=168)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=291)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=482)</b>	<b>1000 or more (N=293)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	35	45	44	44	42	35	37	34
Inadequacy of parent involvement	20	21	21	23	40	29	32	33
Outdated technology	26	31	28	25	42	31	38	32
High student mobility	28	22	27	25	44	37	38	36
Diversity of student populations	39	34	30	24	37	36	42	40
Language barriers	72*+	53+	53*	38*	22*	34	31*	41*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	30	28	26	26	33	38	35	34

**Table 3G - School Size (continued)**

	<b>Moderate Extent</b>				<b>Great Extent</b>			
	<b>Less than 300 (N=168)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=291)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=482)</b>	<b>1000 or more (N=293)</b>	<b>Less than 300 (N=168)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=291)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=482)</b>	<b>1000 or more (N=293)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Inadequacy of guidance on what standards to use	18	17	17	20	6	4	2	3
Inadequacy of parent involvement	31	34	34	30	9	15	14	14
Outdated technology	25	29	23	32	7	8	11	11
High student mobility	22	26	23	22	7	14	12	17
Diversity of student populations	20	22	21	27	4	8	7	9
Language barriers	5+	8*+	12	15*	2*	6	4	7*
Assessments that are not aligned with curriculum/standards	30	23	26	27	7	11	13	13

#### Question 4

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they use written standards to assess teacher quality or professional development, by school characteristics

**Table 4A - Title I Status**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	All Schools (N=1,237)	Non-Title I (N=478)	Title I (N=759)	All Schools (N=1,237)	Non-Title I (N=478)	Title I (N=759)	All Schools (N=1,237)	Non-Title I (N=478)	Title I (N=759)	All Schools (N=1,237)	Non-Title I (N=478)	Title I (N=759)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 37	<u>%</u> 32	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 31	<u>%</u> 40
The quality of professional development	17	16	17	23	25	21	40	39	40	21	20	21

**Table 4B - School Type**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Non-Title I (N=478)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=316)	Non-Title I (N=478)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=316)	Non-Title I (N=478)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=316)	Non-Title I (N=478)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=316)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 12	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 13	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 37	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 31	<u>%</u> 31	<u>%</u> 41	<u>%</u> 39
The quality of professional development	16	15	18	25	20	23	39	39	42	20	26	17

**Table 4C - Minority Enrollment**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	0-49.9% (N=595)	50-79.9% (N=341)	80-100% (N=301)	0-49.9% (N=595)	50-79.9% (N=341)	80-100% (N=301)	0-49.9% (N=595)	50-79.9% (N=341)	80-100% (N=301)	0-49.9% (N=595)	50-79.9% (N=341)	80-100% (N=301)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 12	<u>%</u> 20	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 17	<u>%</u> 7	<u>%</u> 35	<u>%</u> 32	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 35	<u>%</u> 38	<u>%</u> 36
The quality of professional development	16	15	21	25	19	19	41	40	37	18	26	23

**Question 4 (continued)**

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they use written standards to assess teacher quality or professional development, by school characteristics

**Table 4D - School Level**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Elemen- tary (N=542)	Middle (N=326)	High (N=315)	Elemen- tary (N=542)	Middle (N=326)	High (N=315)	Elemen- tary (N=542)	Middle (N=326)	High (N=315)	Elemen- tary (N=542)	Middle (N=326)	High (N=315)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 19	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 7	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 38	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 37	<u>%</u> 40	<u>%</u> 31
The quality of professional development	18	14	15	23	23	25	39	39	42	21	24	18

**Table 4E - Metropolitan Status**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Central City of MSA (N=415)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=481)	Central City of MSA (N=415)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=481)	Central City of MSA (N=415)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=481)	Central City of MSA (N=415)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=481)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 12	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 32	<u>%</u> 35	<u>%</u> 38	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 36
The quality of professional development	17	16	17	16	26	25	42	39	39	25	19	19

**Table 4F - Poverty Level**

	Not at All				Small Extent			
	0-34.9% (N=397)	35-49.9% (N=197)	50-74.9% (N=316)	75-100% (N=313)	0-34.9% (N=397)	35-49.9% (N=197)	50-74.9% (N=316)	75-100% (N=313)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 10	<u>%</u> 12	<u>%</u> 18	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 17	<u>%</u> 10
The quality of professional development	16	14	16	20	25	26	19	17

Question 4 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they use written standards to assess teacher quality or professional development, by school characteristics

Table 4F - Poverty Level (continued)

	Moderate Extent				Great Extent			
	0-34.9% (N=397)	35-49.9% (N=197)	50-74.9% (N=316)	75-100% (N=313)	0-34.9% (N=397)	35-49.9% (N=197)	50-74.9% (N=316)	75-100% (N=313)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 38	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 35	<u>%</u> 38	<u>%</u> 38	<u>%</u> 39
The quality of professional development	39	43	42	37	20	17	23	26

Table 4G - School Size

	Not at All				Small Extent			
	Less than 300 (N=169)	300-499 (N=291)	500-999 (N=482)	1,000 or more (N=295)	Less than 300 (N=169)	300-499 (N=291)	500-999 (N=482)	1,000 or more (N=295)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 18	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 15	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 15
The quality of professional development	19	17	16	13	29	22	21	18

Table 4G - School Size (continued)

	Moderate Extent				Great Extent			
	Less than 300 (N=169)	300-499 (N=291)	500-999 (N=482)	1,000 or more (N=295)	Less than 300 (N=169)	300-499 (N=291)	500-999 (N=482)	1,000 or more (N=295)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 42	<u>%</u> 31	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 27	<u>%</u> 40	<u>%</u> 38	<u>%</u> 37
The quality of professional development	34	37	43	48	18	23	20	21

## Question 5

Percentage of principals reporting who developed standards for assessing teacher quality and professional development activities, by school characteristics

**Table 5A - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=1,093)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=421)</b>	<b>Title I (N=672)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality			
School	34	35	33
School district	83	84	82
State	49	53	47
National association	8	7	10
Professional development activities			
School	51	50	52
School district	85	89*	82
State	38	40	36
National association	7	7	7

**Table 5B - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I (N=421)</b>	<b>SW (N=399)</b>	<b>TA (N=273)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality			
School	35	34	32
School district	84	79	85
State	53	57*	38*
National association	7	8	11
Professional development activities			
School	50	57	47
School district	89*	82	83*
State	40	46*	28*
National association	7	8	5



**Question 5 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting who developed standards for assessing teacher quality and professional development activities, by school characteristics**

**Table 5C - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=527)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=309)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=257)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality			
School	35	32	30
School district	83	83	82
State	46	55	56
National association	9	5	8
Professional development activities			
School	50	53	53
School district	85	88	82
State	36	42	41
National association	7	7	7

**Table 5D - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=468)</b>	<b>Middle (N=295)</b>	<b>High (N=278)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality			
School	34	30	39
School district	83	81	84
State	46	54	53
National association	10	6	7
Professional development activities			
School	51	49	55
School district	85	85	86
State	36	39	43
National association	8	5	5

**Question 5 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting who developed standards for assessing teacher quality and professional development activities, by school characteristics**

**Table 5E - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City of MSA (N=367)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=297)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=429)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality			
School	35	33	34
School district	88	87*	77*
State	48	45	53
National association	9	7	8
Professional development activities			
School	60*	50	47*
School district	86	88	83
State	34	36	41
National association	8	6	6

**Table 5F - Poverty Level**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=347)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=182)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=284)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=271)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality				
School	35	33	32	34
School district	85	79	83	81
State	42*+	54	54	59*
National association	9	10	5	10
Professional development activities				
School	51	45	52	57
School district	86	85	86	83
State	36	35	43	41
National association	6	7	7	9

**Question 5 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting who developed standards for assessing teacher quality and professional development activities, by school characteristics**

**Table 5G - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=149)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=253)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=435)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=256)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality				
School	31	32	35	42
School district	80	80	85	88
State	46	46	51	59
National association	8	10	8	7
Professional development activities				
School	40+	48+	56	63*
School district	78+	87	88	85
State	45	33	37	42
National association	2*+	10	7	6*

## Question 6

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent standards for teacher quality and for professional development are linked to student content and performance standards, by school characteristics

**Table 6A - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=1,037)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=415)</b>	<b>Title I (N=658)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	12	14	11
Small extent	22	21	22
Moderate extent	32	31	33
Great extent	33	33	33
Student standards not established	1	1	1
The quality of professional development			
Not at all	7	9	6
Small extent	17	19	16
Moderate extent	34	33	35
Great extent	40	37	42
Student standards not established	2	2	2

**Table 6B - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I (N=415)</b>	<b>SW (N=396)</b>	<b>TA (N=262)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	14	8	13
Small extent	21	23	21
Moderate extent	31	30	36
Great extent	33	38	28
Student standards not established	1	1	2
The quality of professional development <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	9	5	7
Small extent	19	16	16
Moderate extent	33	31	38
Great extent	37	48	37
Student standards not established	2	1	2

Question 6 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent standards for teacher quality and for professional development are linked to student content and performance standards, by school characteristics

**Table 6C - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=513)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=305)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=255)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	12	13	10
Small extent	23	23	15
Moderate extent	32	31	35
Great extent	31	22	39
Student standards not established	1	<1	1
The quality of professional development <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	7	7	10
Small extent	18	17	13
Moderate extent	34	36	31
Great extent	39	40	45
Student standards not established	2	<1	2

**Table 6D - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=459)</b>	<b>Middle (N=290)</b>	<b>High (N=273)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	12	12	13
Small extent	23	21	23
Moderate extent	30	37	32
Great extent	34	30	32
Student standards not established	1	1	1
The quality of professional development <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	6	6	10
Small extent	18	15	18
Moderate extent	31	39	37
Great extent	42	38	34
Student standards not established	2	2	1

Question 6 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent standards for teacher quality and for professional development are linked to student content and performance standards, by school characteristics

**Table 6E - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City of MSA (N=363)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=295)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=415)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	12	10	13
Small extent	22	25	19
Moderate extent	27	34	34
Great extent	38	38	32
Student standards not established	<1	2	1
The quality of professional development <sup>a</sup>			
Not at all	7	6	8
Small extent	18	15	18
Moderate extent	30	38	34
Great extent	44	39	38
Student standards not established	1	2	2

**Table 6F - Poverty Level**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=339)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=177)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=280)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=268)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality <sup>b</sup>				
Not at all	12	13	13	8
Small extent	22	24	21	21
Moderate extent	31	37	35	29
Great extent	34	26	31	42
Student standards not established	2	0	<1	1
The quality of professional development <sup>b</sup>				
Not at all	7	8	6	6
Small extent	17	20	16	18
Moderate extent	33	34	37	32
Great extent	40	38	40	43
Student standards not established	3	0	<1	2

**Question 6 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent standards for teacher quality and for professional development are linked to student content and performance standards, by school characteristics**

**Table 6G - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=143)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=250)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=427)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=253)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher quality <sup>a</sup>				
Not at all	11	14	11	11
Small extent	23	21	23	19
Moderate extent	35	29	32	36
Great extent	29	37	33	33
Student standards not established	2	1	1	1
The quality of professional development <sup>a</sup>				
Not at all	7	10	6	6
Small extent	23	19	15	11
Moderate extent	34	27	38	42
Great extent	33	43	41	40
Student standards not established	3	1	1	1

## Question 7

Percentage of principals reporting when standards for teacher quality and professional development were last revised, by school characteristics

**Table 7A - Title I Status**

	Last Year			2-3 Years Ago			More Than 3 Years Ago			Don't Know		
	All Schools (N=1,072)	Non-Title I (N=412)	Title I (N=660)	All Schools (N=1,072)	Non-Title I (N=412)	Title I (N=660)	All Schools (N=1,072)	Non-Title I (N=412)	Title I (N=660)	All Schools (N=1,072)	Non-Title I (N=412)	Title I (N=660)
Teacher quality	$\frac{\%}{32}$	$\frac{\%}{31}$	$\frac{\%}{33}$	$\frac{\%}{23}$	$\frac{\%}{23}$	$\frac{\%}{24}$	$\frac{\%}{24}$	$\frac{\%}{25}$	$\frac{\%}{23}$	$\frac{\%}{20}$	$\frac{\%}{21}$	$\frac{\%}{19}$
The quality of professional development	36	33	38	25	23	26	14	15	14	25	30	23

**Table 7B - School Type**

	Last Year			2-3 Years Ago			More Than 3 Years Ago			Don't Know		
	Non-Title I (N=412)	SW (N=394)	TA (N=266)	Non-Title I (N=412)	SW (N=394)	TA (N=266)	Non-Title I (N=412)	SW (N=394)	TA (N=266)	Non-Title I (N=412)	SW (N=394)	TA (N=266)
Teacher quality	$\frac{\%}{31}$	$\frac{\%}{39}$	$\frac{\%}{29}$	$\frac{\%}{23}$	$\frac{\%}{23}$	$\frac{\%}{24}$	$\frac{\%}{25}$	$\frac{\%}{18}$	$\frac{\%}{28}$	$\frac{\%}{21}$	$\frac{\%}{20}$	$\frac{\%}{19}$
The quality of professional development	33	42	34	23	24	28	15	13	15	30	22	23

**Table 7C - Minority Enrollment**

	Last Year			2-3 Years Ago			More Than 3 Years Ago			Don't Know		
	0-49.9% (N=513)	50-79.9% (N=304)	80-100% (N=255)	0-49.9% (N=513)	50-79.9% (N=304)	80-100% (N=255)	0-49.9% (N=513)	50-79.9% (N=304)	80-100% (N=255)	0-49.9% (N=513)	50-79.9% (N=304)	80-100% (N=255)
Teacher quality	$\frac{\%}{29^*}$	$\frac{\%}{37}$	$\frac{\%}{39^*}$	$\frac{\%}{25}$	$\frac{\%}{23}$	$\frac{\%}{18}$	$\frac{\%}{27}$	$\frac{\%}{21}$	$\frac{\%}{16^*}$	$\frac{\%}{19}$	$\frac{\%}{19}$	$\frac{\%}{27}$
The quality of professional development	34	41	36	25	26	20	15	14	11	26	19	33



Question 7 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting when standards for teacher quality and professional development were last revised, by school characteristics

Table 7D - School Level

	Last Year			2-3 Years Ago			More Than 3 Years Ago			Don't Know		
	Elementary (N=459)	Middle (N=289)	High (N=273)	Elementary (N=459)	Middle (N=289)	High (N=273)	Elementary (N=459)	Middle (N=289)	High (N=273)	Elementary (N=459)	Middle (N=289)	High (N=273)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 31	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 32	<u>%</u> 23	<u>%</u> 25	<u>%</u> 23	<u>%</u> 24	<u>%</u> 27	<u>%</u> 25	<u>%</u> 22	<u>%</u> 14	<u>%</u> 20
The quality of professional development	33	39	38	25	24	25	15	13	13	26	22	26

Table 7E - Metropolitan Status

	Last Year			2-3 Years Ago			More Than 3 Years Ago			Don't Know		
	Central City of MSA (N=362)	MSA not Central City (N=292)	Not MSA (N=418)	Central City of MSA (N=362)	MSA not Central City (N=292)	Not MSA (N=418)	Central City of MSA (N=362)	MSA not Central City (N=292)	Not MSA (N=418)	Central City of MSA (N=362)	MSA not Central City (N=292)	Not MSA (N=418)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 32	<u>%</u> 30	<u>%</u> 21	<u>%</u> 21	<u>%</u> 27	<u>%</u> 22	<u>%</u> 27	<u>%</u> 24	<u>%</u> 21	<u>%</u> 20	<u>%</u> 19
The quality of professional development	36	34	37	24	25	25	14	16	13	26	25	25

Table 7F - Poverty Level

	Last Year				2-3 Years Ago			
	0-34.9% (N=337)	35-49.9% (N=179)	50-74.9% (N=279)	75-100% (N=268)	0-34.9% (N=337)	35-49.9% (N=179)	50-74.9% (N=279)	75-100% (N=268)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 29	<u>%</u> 35	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 40	<u>%</u> 23	<u>%</u> 26	<u>%</u> 23	<u>%</u> 21
The quality of professional development	34	33	37	42	26	25	27	18

Question 7 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting when standards for teacher quality and professional development were last revised, by school characteristics

Table 7F - Poverty Level (continued)

	More Than 3 Years Ago				Don't Know			
	0-34.9% (N=337)	35-49.9% (N=179)	50-74.9% (N=279)	75-100% (N=268)	0-34.9% (N=337)	35-49.9% (N=179)	50-74.9% (N=279)	75-100% (N=268)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 28	<u>%</u> 23	<u>%</u> 24	<u>%</u> 13	<u>%</u> 20	<u>%</u> 16	<u>%</u> 19	<u>%</u> 26
The quality of professional development	14	14	17	11	26	28	20	30

Table 7G - School Size

	Last Year				2-3 Years Ago			
	Less than 300 (N=146)	300-499 (N=249)	500-999 (N=423)	1,000 or more (N=254)	Less than 300 (N=146)	300-499 (N=249)	500-999 (N=423)	1,000 or more (N=254)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 32	<u>%</u> 30	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 34	<u>%</u> 28	<u>%</u> 22	<u>%</u> 22	<u>%</u> 25
The quality of professional development	37	31	37	40	27	29	21	21

Table 7G - School Size (continued)

	More Than 3 Years Ago				Don't Know			
	Less than 300 (N=146)	300-499 (N=249)	500-999 (N=423)	1,000 or more (N=254)	Less than 300 (N=146)	300-499 (N=249)	500-999 (N=423)	1,000 or more (N=254)
Teacher quality	<u>%</u> 20	<u>%</u> 30	<u>%</u> 22	<u>%</u> 24	<u>%</u> 20	<u>%</u> 19	<u>%</u> 21	<u>%</u> 17
The quality of professional development	9	17	15	17	27	24	27	23

## Question 8

Percentage of principals reporting performance levels for student achievement results in reading, by school characteristics

**Table 8RA - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=1257)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=484)</b>	<b>Title I (N=773)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	29	25*	32
No performance levels reported	71	75*	68

**Table 8RB - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I (N=484)</b>	<b>SW (N=448)</b>	<b>TA (N=325)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	25	33	32
No performance levels reported	75	67	68

**Table 8RC - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=603)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=346)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=308)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	30	30	26
No performance levels reported	70	70	74

**Table 8RD - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=549)</b>	<b>Middle (N=335)</b>	<b>High (N=315)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	34	27*	18*
No performance levels reported	66	73*	82*

**Question 8 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting performance levels for student achievement results in reading, by school characteristics**

**Table 8RE - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City of MSA (N=420)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=348)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=489)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	29	31	28
No performance levels reported	71	69	72

**Table 8RF - Poverty Level**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=401)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=202)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=320)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=320)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	32	23	29	27
No performance levels reported	68	77	71	73

**Table 8RG - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=172)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=293)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=496)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=296)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	25*	39*+	26	22
No performance levels reported	75*	61*+	74	78

**Question 8 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting performance levels for student achievement results in mathematics, by school characteristics**

**Table 8MA - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=1257)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=484)</b>	<b>Title I (N=773)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	27	25	29
No performance levels reported	73	75	71

**Table 8MB - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I (N=484)</b>	<b>SW (N=448)</b>	<b>TA (N=325)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	25	30	29
No performance levels reported	75	70	71

**Table 8MC - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=603)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=346)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=308)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	29	25	24
No performance levels reported	71	75	76

**Table 8MD - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=549)</b>	<b>Middle (N=335)</b>	<b>High (N=315)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	31	27*	19*
No performance levels reported	69	73*	82*

**Question 8 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting performance levels for student achievement results in mathematics, by school characteristics**

**Table 8ME - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City Of MSA (N=420)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=348)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=489)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	27	31	25
No performance levels reported	73	69	75

**Table 8MF - Poverty Level**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=401)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=202)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=320)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=320)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	31	24	24	24
No performance levels reported	69	76	76	76

**Table 8MG - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=172)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=293)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=496)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=296)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Performance levels reported (1-6)	23*	35*+	25	21
No performance levels reported	77*	65*+	75	79

## Question 9

Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in reading for various categories, by school characteristics

**Table 9A - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=1,203)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=459)</b>	<b>Title I (N=744)</b>
Student achievement results in reading are disaggregated	<u>%</u> 62	<u>%</u> 54*	<u>%</u> 67
Gender	70	75	67
Race/ethnicity	64	68	62
Title I participation	50	26*	63
Migrant status	22	14*	26
Poverty status	42	37	44
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	50	50	50
Disabling condition	52	56	50

**Table 9B - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I (N=459)</b>	<b>SW (N=432)</b>	<b>TA (N=312)</b>
Student achievement results in reading are disaggregated	<u>%</u> 54*	<u>%</u> 70	<u>%</u> 65*
Gender	75	70	64
Race/ethnicity	68	70*	54*
Title I participation	26*	64	63*
Migrant status	14*	30	23
Poverty status	37*	55*	35
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	50	58*	44
Disabling condition	56	54	45

**Question 9 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in reading for various categories, by school characteristics**

**Table 9C - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=573)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=333)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=297)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in reading are disaggregated	58*	70	64
Gender	71	74	62
Race/ethnicity	62	69	65
Title I participation	42*	60	65*
Migrant status	18*	26	33*
Poverty status	38*	47	47
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	46	49*	67*
Disabling condition	53	47	56

**Table 9D - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=532)</b>	<b>Middle (N=322)</b>	<b>High (N=296)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in reading are disaggregated	63	64*	53*
Gender	70	64	80
Race/ethnicity	63	66	63
Title I participation	54	49*	31*
Migrant status	23	22	15
Poverty status	42	39	44
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	52	52	40
Disabling condition	51	52	54



Question 9 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in reading for various categories, by school characteristics

Table 9E - Metropolitan Status

	Central City of MSA (N=404)	MSA not Central City (N=330)	Not MSA (N=469)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in reading are disaggregated	72*	60	56*
Gender	69	66	73
Race/ethnicity	74*	58	61*
Title I participation	52	42	53
Migrant status	21	21	24
Poverty status	47	33	44
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	52*	69*	35*
Disabling condition	44	55	55

Table 9F - Poverty Level

	0-34.9% (N=376)	35-49.9% (N=197)	50-74.9% (N=309)	75-100% (N=307)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in reading are disaggregated	55*	68	73	66*
Gender	69	71	74	65
Race/ethnicity	58	66	69	70
Title I participation	37*+	56	57*	67*
Migrant status	16+	23	26	32*
Poverty status	34+	46	45	51*
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	49	44	49	63
Disabling condition	58	44	47	53

**Question 9 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in reading for various categories, by school characteristics**

**Table 9G - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=166)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=282)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=474)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=281)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in reading are disaggregated	54	63	66	58
Gender	69	66	74	69
Race/ethnicity	51+	62+	70	73*
Title I participation	62	49+	48*	34*
Migrant status	18	23	24	21
Poverty status	42	40	43	42
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	25*+	49+	58*	70*
Disabling condition	55	53	48	55

## Question 10

Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in mathematics for various categories, by school characteristics

**Table 10A - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=1,192)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=458)</b>	<b>Title I (N=734)</b>
Student achievement results in mathematics are disaggregated	<u>%</u> 60	<u>%</u> 53*	<u>%</u> 65
Gender	70	75	67
Race/ethnicity	65	70	62
Title I participation	47	24*	60
Migrant status	22	13*	28
Poverty status	41	35*	45
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	50	48	52
Disabling condition	51	55	49

**Table 10B - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I (N=458)</b>	<b>SW (N=428)</b>	<b>TA (N=306)</b>
Student achievement results in mathematics are disaggregated	<u>%</u> 53*	<u>%</u> 67	<u>%</u> 63*
Gender	75	71	64
Race/ethnicity	70	70*	55*
Title I participation	24*	62	58*
Migrant status	13*	31	24*
Poverty status	35*	56*	35
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	48*	60*	44
Disabling condition	55	54	45

**Question 10 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in mathematics for various categories, by school characteristics**

**Table 10C - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=568)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=331)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=293)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in mathematics are disaggregated	57*	67	62
Gender	70	73	65
Race/ethnicity	63	70	67
Title I participation	37*	58	68*
Migrant status	17*	28	34*
Poverty status	37*	47	50*
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	46	49*	67*
Disabling condition	52	49	54

**Table 10D - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=517)</b>	<b>Middle (N=324)</b>	<b>High (N=299)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in mathematics are disaggregated	61	62	53
Gender	69	67	80
Race/ethnicity	63	68	69
Title I participation	51	47*	30*
Migrant status	23	23	18
Poverty status	41	40	42
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	53	48	42
Disabling condition	50	53	56

**Question 10 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in mathematics for various categories, by school characteristics**

**Table 10E - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City of MSA (N=400)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=328)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=464)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in mathematics are disaggregated	70*	59	55*
Gender	70	67	72
Race/ethnicity	74*	59	63
Title I participation	50	39	50
Migrant status	21	20	25
Poverty status	48*	32	43
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	51*	67*	38*
Disabling condition	45	54	54

**Table 10F - Poverty Level**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=372)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=196)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=306)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=304)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in mathematics are disaggregated	54*+	66	69	65*
Gender	69	72	73	67
Race/ethnicity	60	67	70	70
Title I participation	31*+	55	55*	68*
Migrant status	15*+	24	27	33*
Poverty status	34+	44	45	55*
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	49	44	49	63
Disabling condition	58*	40	49	52

**Question 10 (continued)**

Percentage of principals reporting disaggregated student achievement results in mathematics for various categories, by school characteristics

**Table 10G - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=163)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=274)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=472)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=283)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Student achievement results in mathematics are disaggregated	54	61	63	56
Gender	67	66	75	70
Race/ethnicity	54	62	71	72
Title I participation	58	47+	45*	30*
Migrant status	20	22	24	21
Poverty status	39	40	44	41
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	33+	48+	56*	68*
Disabling condition	52	53	49	56

## Question 11

Percentage of principals reporting categories for which student achievement is in the greatest need of improvement, by school characteristics

**Table 11A - Title I Status**

	<b>All schools (N=703)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=235)</b>	<b>Title I (N=468)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Racial/ethnic minorities	47	52	44
Females	11	10	12
Males	22	20	23
Title I participation	31	14*	41
Migrant students	8	8	9
Students in poverty	46	41	48
LEP students	28	27	29
Students with disabilities	41	43	40

**Table 11B - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I schools (N=235)</b>	<b>SW (N=288)</b>	<b>TA (N=180)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Racial/ethnic minorities	52	55*	34*
Females	10	12	11
Males	20	23	22
Title I participation	14*	37	45*
Migrant students	8	10	7
Students in poverty	41*	57*	40
LEP students	27	33	26
Students with disabilities	43	36	44

**Question 11 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting categories for which student achievement is in the greatest need of improvement, by school characteristics**

**Table 11C - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=420)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=257)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=201)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Racial/ethnic minorities	42*	57	49
Females	10	12	12
Males	20	27	20
Title I participation	28	33	40
Migrant students	9	7	9
Students in poverty	40*	57	49
LEP students	23	30	43*
Students with disabilities	45	35	37

**Table 11D - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=321)</b>	<b>Middle (N=211)</b>	<b>High (N=144)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Racial/ethnic minorities	47	48	47
Females	11	8	16
Males	23	17	21
Title I participation	35	27	21*
Migrant students	10	5	5
Students in poverty	45	41	50
LEP students	29	27	31
Students with disabilities	41	40	43



**Question 11 (continued)**

Percentage of principals reporting categories for which student achievement is in the greatest need of improvement, by school characteristics

**Table 11E - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City of MSA (N=279)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=195)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=229)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Racial/ethnic minorities	58*	43	41*
Females	12	9	12
Males	24	18	22
Title I participation	29	27	36
Migrant students	7	5	12
Students in poverty	53*	31*	51
LEP students	33	40*	15*
Students with disabilities	34	45	44

**Table 11F - Poverty Level**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=183)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=117)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=201)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=201)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Racial/ethnic minorities	39+	49	57	51*
Females	10	13	12	11
Males	18	23	28	21
Title I participation	23*	41	32	39*
Migrant students	7	12	8	10
Students in poverty	36*+	48	56	54*
LEP students	26	23	31	37
Students with disabilities	52	32	33	35

**Question 11 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting categories for which student achievement is in the greatest need of improvement, by school characteristics**

**Table 11G - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=81)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=165)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=289)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=168)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Racial/ethnic minorities	33*+	49	49	58*
Females	15	11	10	9
Males	23	22	23	12
Title I participation	32	31	32	25
Migrant students	7	12	6	8
Students in poverty	52	46	41	48
LEP students	17+	21*+	33*	54*
Students with disabilities	49	42	36	45

## Question 12A

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics

Table 12AA - Title I Status

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non-Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>52</u>
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	1	1	1	13	12	14	45	53*	39	41	35*	45
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	<1	1	<1	9	9	10	39	40	39	51	50	52
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	8	5	10	30	29	30	36	38	34	27	27	27
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	3	2	3	26	27	25	44	48	41	28	24	31
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	<1	<1	<1	11	13	10	48	46	49	41	41	41

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AA - Title I Status (continued)**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non- Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non- Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non- Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)	All Schools (N=1,232)	Non- Title I (N=476)	Title I (N=756)
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	<u>%</u> 2	<u>%</u> 3	<u>%</u> 2	<u>%</u> 18	<u>%</u> 20	<u>%</u> 17	<u>%</u> 45	<u>%</u> 45	<u>%</u> 45	<u>%</u> 35	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 37
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	2	3	1	17	16	18	40	45	37	41	37	44
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	3	4	3	39	46*	34	43	38*	47	14	13	16
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	19	19	19	31	32	31	31	31	32	18	18	18
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	52	54	51	24	26	22	15	13	17	9	7	10
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	63	68*	59	19	20	18	13	10*	15	5	3*	8
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	17	17	17	39	40	38	34	35	33	10	8	12

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AB - School Type**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance <sup>a</sup>	2	1*	5	13*	6*	13	39	33	38	45*	61*	45
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	1	<1	1	12	13	15	53*	38	41*	35*	49	42
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	1	<1	<1	9	10	9	40	36	41	50	54	49
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	5*	13*	7	29	32	28	38	33	36	27	23	30
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	2	4	3	27	22	29	48	40	41	24	35	27
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities** <sup>b</sup>	<1	0	<1	13	12	9	46	45	52	41	43	39
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	3	1	2	20	14	19	45	44	46	33	41	34
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	3	1	1	16	14	21	45*	34	39	37*	50*	39

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AB - School Type (continued)**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=476)	SW (N=441)	TA (N=315)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	4	2	3	46*	35	34*	38*	46	49*	13*	18	14
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	19	14*	23	32	26*	35	31	35	28	18	24*	14
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	54*	43*	58	26	23	21	13*	22*	13	7*	12	8
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	68*	54*	64	20	20	16	10*	16	14	3*	10*	5
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	17	17	17	40	35	41	35	36	30	8	12	11

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AC - Minority Enrollment**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	0-49.9% (N=591)	50-79.9% (N=342)	80-100% (N=299)	0-49.9% (N=591)	50-79.9% (N=342)	80-100% (N=299)	0-49.9% (N=591)	50-79.9% (N=342)	80-100% (N=299)	0-49.9% (N=591)	50-79.9% (N=342)	80-100% (N=299)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance <sup>a</sup>	3	2	<1*	12	9	9	38	37	31	46	51	60*
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	1	1	<1	13	17	10	47	40	41	39	42	48
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	1	<1	<1	10	9	9	39	43	36	51	48	55
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	5*	11	13*	28	31	35	38	37*	28*	29*	21	25
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students <sup>**a</sup>	2	4	2	29*	21	18*	45	38	43	23*	36	37*
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities <sup>**</sup>	<1	<1	<1	11	13	13	48	45	49	42	41	38
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	2	2	2	16	18	23	46	48	37	35	32	38
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement <sup>a</sup>	2	1	1	16	21	16	43*	34	35*	38	44	49*

<sup>\*\*</sup> Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AC - Minority Enrollment (continued)**

	<b>Not at All</b>			<b>Small Extent</b>			<b>Moderate Extent</b>			<b>Great Extent</b>		
	<b>0-49.9%</b>	<b>50-79.9%</b>	<b>80-100%</b>	<b>0-49.9%</b>	<b>50-79.9%</b>	<b>80-100%</b>	<b>0-49.9%</b>	<b>50-79.9%</b>	<b>80-100%</b>	<b>0-49.9%</b>	<b>50-79.9%</b>	<b>80-100%</b>
	<b>(N=591)</b>	<b>(N=342)</b>	<b>(N=299)</b>	<b>(N=591)</b>	<b>(N=342)</b>	<b>(N=299)</b>	<b>(N=591)</b>	<b>(N=342)</b>	<b>(N=299)</b>	<b>(N=591)</b>	<b>(N=342)</b>	<b>(N=299)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	3	4	3	41	37	33	42	47	45	14	13	20
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	20	19	16	35*	27	23*	29	34	36	16	19	25*
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	58*	46	38*	23	24	24	11*	23	22*	7	7*	17*
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	67*	56	56*	19	20	15	11*	17	17*	4	7	12*
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	18	17	14	41	35	34	32	37	37	9	10	15



**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AD - School Level**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Elemen- tary (N=539)	Middle (N=331)	High (N=305)	Elemen- tary (N=539)	Middle (N=331)	High (N=305)	Elemen- tary (N=539)	Middle (N=331)	High (N=305)	Elemen- tary (N=539)	Middle (N=331)	High (N=305)
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	% 3*	% 1	% 3	% 11	% 11	% 14	% 33*	% 43	% 45*	% 54*	% 45	% 37*
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	<1	1	2	14*	9*	17	39*	53	53*	46*	36*	28*
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn <sup>b</sup>	0	<1	2	9	9	11	37	43	44	54	47	43
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	11*	4	2*	32	27	23*	35	40	36	23	28*	39*
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	4	<1	2	25	25	33	42	51	42	30	24	23
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities** <sup>b</sup>	0	0	1	12	7	13	44	49	54	43	44	32
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	2	1	3	16	20	22	46	42	47	36	36	29
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	2	1	3	17	18	18	40	40	43	42	40	37

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AD - School Level (continued)**

	<b>Not at All</b>			<b>Small Extent</b>			<b>Moderate Extent</b>			<b>Great Extent</b>		
	<b>Elemen- tary (N=539)</b>	<b>Middle (N=331)</b>	<b>High (N=305)</b>	<b>Elemen- tary (N=539)</b>	<b>Middle (N=331)</b>	<b>High (N=305)</b>	<b>Elemen- tary (N=539)</b>	<b>Middle (N=331)</b>	<b>High (N=305)</b>	<b>Elemen- tary (N=539)</b>	<b>Middle (N=331)</b>	<b>High (N=305)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	1	4	9*	31*	49	55*	49*	35	30*	18	12	6*
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	20	17	21	32	35	26	32	28	30	16	20	22
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	53	51	53	22	26	25	16	15	13	9	8	9
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	63	63	64	17	22	24*	14	12	9	7*	3	3*
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	19	18	10	39	41	37	32	32	43	10	9	9

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AE - Metropolitan Status**

	Not at All			Small Extent			Moderate Extent			Great Extent		
	Central City of MSA (N=414)	MSA not Central City (N=342)	Not MSA (N=476)	Central City of MSA (N=414)	MSA not Central City (N=342)	Not MSA (N=476)	Central City of MSA (N=414)	MSA not Central City (N=342)	Not MSA (N=476)	Central City of MSA (N=414)	MSA not Central City (N=342)	Not MSA (N=476)
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	<u>%</u> 1	<u>%</u> 2	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 6	<u>%</u> 11	<u>%</u> 15*	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 40	<u>%</u> 60	<u>%</u> 51*	<u>%</u> 42*
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	<1	1	1	11	11	16	37	46	49*	52	43	34*
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	<1	1	1	10	10	9	33	37	45	57	53	46
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	8	6	8	33	27	29	36	40	33	22	27	30
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	1	2	5	19	30	28	48	39	45	32	29	22
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities** <sup>b</sup>	0	<1	<1	11	11	12	46	43	52	43	45	37
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	1	2	2	20	18	16	41	47	46	38	32	36
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	1	3	1	14	16	20	38	42	40	47	39	39

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AE - Metropolitan Status (continued)**

	<b>Not at All</b>			<b>Small Extent</b>			<b>Moderate Extent</b>			<b>Great Extent</b>		
	<b>Central City of MSA (N=414)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=342)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=476)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=414)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=342)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=476)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=414)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=342)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=476)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=414)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=342)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=476)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	1	3	4*	35	37	43*	46	42	43	18	18*	10*
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	19	20	19	25	36	32	33	29	31	24	14	17
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	42*	56	56*	25	23	23	20	14	14*	13	8	7*
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	58	65	64	19	19	18	15	11	13	8	5	5
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	15	17	18	38	41	38	35	33	34	12	9	10

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AF - Poverty Level**

	<b>Not at All</b>				<b>Small Extent</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	4	3	2	<1	12	14	10	7
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	1	2	<1	<1	13	9*	19*	10
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn <sup>b</sup>	1	<1	0	<1	10	10	9	10
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	6	4*+	11	13*	26	31	33	35*
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students <sup>**a</sup>	3	3	4	2	29	27	25*	14*
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities <sup>**b</sup>	<1	<1	0	<1	10	11	15	10
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	3	2	1	2	19	13	18	19
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement <sup>a</sup>	3+	1	<1	1	16	14	22	14

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AF - Poverty Level (continued)**

	<b>Not at All</b>				<b>Small Extent</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	3	3	3	2	39	43	39	31
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	22*	13	20	15	35+	35+	26	24*
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	59+	55+	46	37*	25	22	24	21
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	70+	61	55	51*	19	20	19	18
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	17	17	16	16	42	39	37	30

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AF - Poverty Level (continued)**

	<b>Moderate Extent</b>				<b>Great Extent</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	38	37	36	31	46	47	51	62
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	51*+	39	38	38*	35*	49	42	52*
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn <sup>b</sup>	37	44	44	33	52	46	47	57
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	40	34	36*	25*	29+	31*	20	26
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students <sup>**a</sup>	48	42	40	37	20+	28+	32*	47*
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities <sup>**b</sup>	47	55	44	49	43	34	41	41
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	42	53	49	39	36	32	32	40
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement <sup>a</sup>	45+	37	34	35*	35*	48	44	51*

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AF - Poverty Level (continued)**

	<b>Moderate Extent</b>				<b>Great Extent</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=392)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=318)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=311)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	41	43	46	47	16	10	11	20
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	29	32	34	35	15	20	20	26*
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	11+	12*+	22	25*	5*	11	8*	17*
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	9+	13	19	18*	3+	6+	6*	13*
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	32	34	35	39	8	10	11	15



**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AG - School Size**

	Not at All				Small Extent			
	Less than 300 (N=163)	300-499 (N=285)	500-999 (N=490)	1,000 or more (N=294)	Less than 300 (N=163)	300-499 (N=285)	500-999 (N=490)	1,000 or more (N=294)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	5	3	1	2	14	12	9	9
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	1	1	1	2	21*	8+	12	16
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn <sup>b</sup>	0	<1	<1	1	14	7	9	8
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	11	7	7	5	24	33	31	25
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	11	1	2	2	19	29	24	30
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities** <sup>b</sup>	<1	0	<1	1	12	11	11	12
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	1	2	3	2	18	16	19	19
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	2	2	2	1	24	16	14	15

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AG - School Size (continued)**

	<b>Not at All</b>				<b>Small Extent</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=163)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=285)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=490)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=294)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=163)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=285)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=490)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=294)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	2	3	3	5	42	35	39	45
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	20	20	19	16	35	29	32	29
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	60	51	51	47	23	25	23	24
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	66	63	61	62	15	19	19	24
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	18	17	18	11	38	39	39	38

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AG - School Size (continued)**

	Moderate Extent				Great Extent			
	Less than 300 (N=163)	300-499 (N=285)	500-999 (N=490)	1,000 or more (N=294)	Less than 300 (N=163)	300-499 (N=285)	500-999 (N=490)	1,000 or more (N=294)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	42	31	39	36	39	53	51	53
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn <sup>a</sup>	49	46	42	45	29*+	45	46	37
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn <sup>b</sup>	42	38	41	34	44	55	50	56
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	32	35	38	40	33	25	24	30
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	47	43	43	42	23	26	30	26
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities** <sup>b</sup>	50	47	46	52	38	42	43	35
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	49	43	43	48	32	38	36	31
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	41	39	41	43	33	43	44	42

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12A (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent they are implementing various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12AG - School Size (continued)**

	<b>Moderate Extent</b>				<b>Great Extent</b>			
	<b>Less than 300 (N=163)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=285)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=490)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=294)</b>	<b>Less than 300 (N=163)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=285)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=490)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=294)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	42	47	42	40	14	15	16	10
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	30	34	31	28	15	16	19	27
Extending the school day to provide for more instruction time	13	15	16	15	4	9	10	13
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	16	12	13	9	3	6	6	5
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	34	32	33	41	10	12	9	10

**Table 12AH - Limited-English Proficiency<sup>b</sup>**

Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Small extent</b>	<b>Moderate extent</b>	<b>Great extent</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
LEP enrollment 0-9%	3	31	45	21
LEP enrollment 10-25%	0	12	35	53
LEP enrollment over 25%	0	11	36	53

## Question 12B

Percentage of principals reporting that they need information about various reform strategies, by school characteristics

**Table 12BA - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=878)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=333)</b>	<b>Title I (N=545)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	24	23	24
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	30	28	31
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	12	11	13
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	42	46	39
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	17	17	17
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	9	12	8
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	28	33*	24
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	17	20	15
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	39	33*	43
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	27	29	26
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	17	17	18
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	13	10	14
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	24	24	24

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

Question 12B (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting that they need information about various reform strategies, by school characteristics

Table 12BB - School Type

	<b>Non-Title I Schools (N=333)</b>	<b>SW (N=313)</b>	<b>TA (N=232)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	23	21	26
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	28	27	34
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	11	16	11
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	46	47*	34*
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	17	20	14
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	12	9	6
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	33*	19	27
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	20	17	13
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	33	44	42
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	29	20	31
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	17	15	19
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	10	16	13
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	24	22	26

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

**Question 12B (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting that they need information about various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12BC - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9%</b> <b>(N=420)</b>	<b>50-79.9%</b> <b>(N=257)</b>	<b>80-100%</b> <b>(N=201)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	24	22	26
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	30	29	31
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	12	15	8
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	41	41	46
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	16	20	18
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	11	8	7
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	28	28	22
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	16	21	13
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	36	43	46
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	30	23	22
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	18	15	16
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	12	12	16
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	25	23	22

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

Question 12B (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting that they need information about various reform strategies, by school characteristics

Table 12BD - School Level

	Elementary (N=395)	Middle (N=233)	High (N=208)
	%	%	%
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	23	23	27
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	28	33	29
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	12	12	15
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	43	36	42
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	16	18	18
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	8	13	11
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	26	30	34
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	17	13	22
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	36	39	48
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	30	27	20
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	21	14	9*
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	14	14	10
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	24	27	21

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled



**Question 12B (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting that they need information about various reform strategies, by school characteristics**

**Table 12BE - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City of MSA (N=291)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=245)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=342)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	23	20	26
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	29	26	32
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	9	12	14
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	47	35	43
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	18	17	15
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	8	10	10
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	26	33	25
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	17	13	19
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	35	35	43
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	29	34*	22
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	18	22	14
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	15	17	9
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	22	26	24

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

Question 12B (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting that they need information about various reform strategies, by school characteristics

Table 12BF - Poverty Level

	0-34.9% (N=269)	35-49.9% (N=145)	50-74.9% (N=237)	75-100% (N=220)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	24	25	22	25
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	29	31	29	32
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	12	14	13	10
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	43	33	44	48
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	15	22	22	12
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	11	8	9	8
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	30	28	27	22
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	18	12	22	13
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	32*+	45	42	49*
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	31	28	23	22
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	19	16	14	15
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	13	12	12	14
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	26	21	23	20

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

Question 12B (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting that they need information about various reform strategies, by school characteristics

Table 12BG - School Size

	<b>Less than 300 (N=107)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=200)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=367)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=204)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A strategic plan for enabling students to achieve to high levels of performance	31	21	21	27
Professional development to enable staff to teach the content students are expected to learn	29	26	33	30
Instructional materials such as textbooks that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	15	11	13	9
Innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction that expose students to the content they are expected to learn	42	44	39	47
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically limited-English proficient students**	15	18	17	16
Adaptations so that all students are expected to achieve to high levels of performance, specifically students with learning disabilities**	10	9	9	11
Assessments that measure performance against the content students are expected to learn	26	26	28	32
Assessments that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement	21	16	16	13
Parent involvement activities that help parents work with their children to achieve to high levels of performance	38	37	40	42
Restructuring the school day to teach content in more depth	21	33	28	23
Extending the school day to provide for more instructional time	18	19	16	14
Extending the school year to provide for more instructional time	9	15	13	14
Staff participation in professional networks focused on standards-based reforms	25	24	25	17

\*\* Among schools with these students enrolled

### Question 13

Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics

Table 13A - Title I Status

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non-Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non-Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non-Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non-Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)
Other principals	% 9	% 9	% 9	% 4	% 5	% 4	% 59	% 55	% 61	% 28	% 32	% 26
Professional principal associations	10	7	13	11	11	10	59	62	57	20	19	20
Teacher unions or organizations	31	31	31	34	35	34	32	33	32	3	1	4
Other administrators	3	2	3	4	2	6	63	67	60	30	28	31
School district	3	3	4	7	7	7	54	56	52	36	34	37
Intermediate or regional education agency	22	23	21	17	20	16	47	48	46	14	10	17
State department of education	16	18	14	20	23	18	53	50	55	11	9	13
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	60	62	58	21	23	20	18	13*	21	1	2	1
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	68	69	67	21	22	21	10	8	12	<1	1	<1
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	66	68	64	21	21	21	12	9	13	2	2	1
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	46	44	47	19	20	19	31	33	30	3	2	4
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	60	64	57	20	19	20	19	16	22	1	1	2
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	46	47	46	15	17	13	31	29	32	8	7	9
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	25	23	26	13	13	14	42	44	41	19	20	19

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13A - Title I Status (continued)**

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non- Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non- Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non- Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)	All Schools (N=1,230)	Non- Title I (N=472)	Title I (N=758)
State-developed content standards	% 6	% 6	% 6	% 7	% 7	% 7	% 53	% 54	% 52	% 34	% 33	% 34
Institutions of higher education	22	23	22	22	22	22	45	45	45	10	10	11
Professional journals	15	15	16	9	9	9	55	56	55	20	21	20
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	5	5	5	7	9*	5	59	64	57	29	22*	34
Institutes or workshops	3	4	3	5	6	4	58	62	55	33	28	37
Electronic networks/discussion groups	47	46	49	20	22	18	29	27	31	4	5	3
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	22	24	21	35	34	35	40	39	40	3	3	3

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13B - School Type**

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	Non-Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)	Non-Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)
Other principals	% 9	% 8	% 10	% 5	% 4	% 3	% 55	% 66	% 57	% 32	% 22	% 30
Professional principal associations	7	13	12	11	11	10	62	56	57	19	20	21
Teacher unions or organizations	31	28	33	35	33	35	33	35	28	1	4	4
Other administrators	2	5	2	2	7	5	67	60	61	28	29	32
School district	3	3	4	7	6	9	56	55	50	34	37	37
Intermediate or regional education agency	23	22	21	20	16	15	48	47	45	10	15	19
State department of education	18	16	13	23	16	19	50	56	55	9	12	13
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs <sup>a</sup>	62	55	61	23	24*	16*	13*	20	22*	2	1	1
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	69	66	68	22	22	19	8	12	13	1	<1	<1
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	68	60	68	21	23	19	9	15	12	2	1	1
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	44	48	46	20	21	17	33	27	33	2	4	4
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	64	56	58	19	20	20	16	23	21	1	2	2
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	47	46	46	17	13	13	29	30	33	7	10	8
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	23	29	24	13	13	14	44	44	39	20	14	23
State-developed content standards	6	7	5	7	5	9	54	53	52	33	35	34
Institutions of higher education	23	19	25	22	23	21	45	47	44	10	11	11
Professional journals	15	14	17	9	11	7	56	60	52	21	15	24
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	5	4	5	9	6	5	64	55	58	22*	36	32*

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13B - School Type (continued)**

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	Non- Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)	Non- Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)	Non- Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)	Non- Title I (N=472)	SW (N=443)	TA (N=315)
Institutes or workshops	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 2	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 6	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 62	<u>%</u> 53	<u>%</u> 57	<u>%</u> 28	<u>%</u> 41	<u>%</u> 34
Electronic networks/discussion groups	46	49	48	22	20	17	27	29	33	5	3	2
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	24	22	20	34	29	40	39	44	37	3	4	3

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13C - Minority Enrollment**

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)
Other principals	% 9	% 11	% 6	% 4	% 4	% 4	% 57	% 59	% 65	% 30	% 26	% 25
Professional principal associations	8*	17	11	10	11	12	63*	52	54	19	21	23
Teacher unions or organizations	32	31	27	36	32	30	31	33	35	2	3	7
Other administrators	2	5	1	3	3	9	64	63	59	30	29	30
School district	4	3	2	8	6	7	53	58	50	35	33	42
Intermediate or regional education agency	22	20	24	17	19	15	47	45	49	14	16	12
State department of education	17	12	19	21	18	17	53	58	49	10	12	16
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	63	54	54	21	20	22	15	24	23	2	1	1
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers <sup>a</sup>	70	67	59*	22	19	24	8*	14	16*	<1	<1	1
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	68	65	58	20	21	23	10	13	15	1	<1	4
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	44	50	51	19	18	23	34	31*	19*	3*	1*	8
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	62	58	50	19	19	22	17	22	26	1	1	2
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	48	48	39	15	15	13	30	30	34	7	8	14
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	24	28	25	13	15	12	41	45	43	22	12	19
State-developed content standards	5	6	10	7	10	4	55	52	45	33	32	41
Institutions of higher education	23	23	18	23	24	17	45	43	48	9	9	18
Professional journals	14	16	18	9	11	8	55	56	55	22	17	19
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	5	4	7	6	10	5	62	58	53	28	28	35



**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13C - Minority Enrollment (continued)**

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)	0-49.9% (N=589)	50-79.9% (N=345)	80-100% (N=296)
Institutes or workshops	<u>%</u> 3	<u>%</u> 3	<u>%</u> 5	<u>%</u> 6	<u>%</u> 5	<u>%</u> 3	<u>%</u> 59	<u>%</u> 55	<u>%</u> 58	<u>%</u> 32	<u>%</u> 37	<u>%</u> 34
Electronic networks/discussion groups	46	49	52	21	19	18	30	30	25	4	2	5
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	23	18	27	37	33	26	38	44	41	2	4	5

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13D - School Level**

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	Elemen- tary (N=538)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=307)	Elemen- tary (N=538)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=307)	Elemen- tary (N=538)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=307)	Elemen- tary (N=538)	Middle (N=327)	High (N=307)
Other principals	% 10	% 7	% 7	% 3	% 7	% 4	% 59	% 59	% 57	% 28	% 27	% 32
Professional principal associations	13*	7	7*	12	11	7*	57	60	65	19	21	22
Teacher unions or organizations	32	31	27	36	29	32	28	37	38	3	3	3
Other administrators	3	4	1	4	5	6	65	58	64	29	33	29
School district	4	3	4	6	9	11	55	51	56	36	37	30
Intermediate or regional education agency	26*	15	15*	15	22	20	45	50	50	13	14	16
State department of education	18	18*	8*	18	24	23	54	49	56	11	9	13
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	62	60	53	19	22	28	18	17	18	2	1	1
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	69	69	64	20	22	25	10	8	10	1	0	0
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	67	68	64	20	21	23	12	9	12	2	2	0
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	47	49	42	20	16	18	29	33	39	4	2	2
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	60	61	58	18	22	19	19	17	22	2	1	<1
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	50	41	39	13	17	15	28	33	38	9	9	7
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	26	23	21	12	14	14	42	41	46	19	21	19
State-developed content standards	5	7	7	7	6	7	53	54	52	34	33	34
Institutions of higher education	24	20	19	24	20	19	42	49	50	10	10	13
Professional journals	16	11	18	9	9	7	54	57	60	21	24	15
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	6	4	4	7	8	5	58	62	62	30	27	29

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13D – School Level (continued)**

	<b>Not Used</b>			<b>Not at All Helpful</b>			<b>Somewhat Helpful</b>			<b>Very Helpful</b>		
	<b>Elemen- tary (N=538)</b>	<b>Middle (N=327)</b>	<b>High (N=307)</b>	<b>Elemen- tary (N=538)</b>	<b>Middle (N=327)</b>	<b>High (N=307)</b>	<b>Elemen- tary (N=538)</b>	<b>Middle (N=327)</b>	<b>High (N=307)</b>	<b>Elemen- tary (N=538)</b>	<b>Middle (N=327)</b>	<b>High (N=307)</b>
Institutes or workshops	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 2	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 6	<u>%</u> 5	<u>%</u> 5	<u>%</u> 55	<u>%</u> 65	<u>%</u> 62	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 28	<u>%</u> 29
Electronic networks/discussion groups	52*	42	39*	20	22	18	25	32	39*	3	4	4
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	23	19	24	36	34	31	38	43	40	3	4	4

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13E - Metropolitan Status**

	Not Used			Not at All Helpful			Somewhat Helpful			Very Helpful		
	Central City of MSA (N=411)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=478)	Central City of MSA (N=411)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=478)	Central City of MSA (N=411)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=478)	Central City of MSA (N=411)	MSA not Central City (N=341)	Not MSA (N=478)
Other principals	% 9	% 11	% 8	% 4	% 3	% 5	% 59	% 56	% 60	% 29	% 30	% 27
Professional principal associations	11	9	11	10	12	11	61	58	59	18	21	19
Teacher unions or organizations	30	32	31	31	37	34	34	30	32	5	1	3
Other administrators	3	2	3	3	3	6	66	62	63	28	33	29
School district	2	5	4	5	5	9	55	50	55	38	40	32
Intermediate or regional education agency	30	26*	15*	23*	13	16	38*	51	49*	10	9*	20*
State department of education	21	19*	11*	20	23	17	51	51	56	7	7*	16*
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	62	62	57	22	21	21	15	15	21	1	2	1
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	66	70	68	22	21	21	12	9	10	1	0	1
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	63	65	68	23	19	21	12	14	10	2	1	1
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	50	41	47	21	19	19	25	37	31	4	3	3
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	57	63	59	19	18	21	23	18	18	2	1	1
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	40	45	51	14	15	15	33	32	28	12	8	6
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	23	20	29	14	10	15	46	47	38	17	23	19
State-developed content standards	4	5	7	9	6	7	54	54	52	33	35	34
Institutions of higher education	20	25	22	23	22	22	44	42	47	13	11	8
Professional journals	11	14	18	10	10	8	54	58	55	25	19	19

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13E - Metropolitan Status (continued)**

	<b>Not Used</b>			<b>Not at All Helpful</b>			<b>Somewhat Helpful</b>			<b>Very Helpful</b>		
	<b>Central City of MSA (N=411)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=341)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=478)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=411)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=341)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=478)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=411)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=341)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=478)</b>	<b>Central City of MSA (N=411)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=341)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=478)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	5	4	6	9	6	5	57	62	59	29	28	29
Institutes or workshops	3	4	4	6	5	5	53	60	60	38	31	32
Electronic networks/discussion groups	45	49	47	20	18	21	27	30	30	7	2	3
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	21	28	19	33	33	37	42	37	40	3	2	4

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13F - Poverty Level**

	Not Used				Not at All Helpful			
	0-34.9% (N=391)	35-49.9% (N=197)	50-74.9% (N=319)	75-100% (N=310)	0-34.9% (N=391)	35-49.9% (N=197)	50-74.9% (N=319)	75-100% (N=310)
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Other principals	10	7	11	5	3	7	4	4
Professional principal associations	9	8	16	12	11	11	12	10
Teacher unions or organizations	32	34	32	24	36	33	32	34
Other administrators	3	2	6	1	3	5	4	9
School district	4	3	2	4	7	10	6	8
Intermediate or regional education agency	21	27	22	19	17	16	19	16
State department of education	18	13	11	19	20	21	17	18
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	63	62	52	56	21	21	20	24
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	71	69	67	59	21	21	18	25
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	68	67	66	59	20	19	21	24
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	43	47	49	51	19	17	19	21
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	61	64	58	52	20	20	19	21
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	47	49	48	39	13	19	15	13
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	21*	32	26	28	12	19	15	12
State-developed content standards	5	3	5	11	6	9	10	4
Institutions of higher education	23	24	22	19	24	19	23	20
Professional journals	13	21	14	19	9	9	12	6
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	4	6	4	7	6	8	8	7
Institutes or workshops	4	4	3	3	5	6	5	5

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13F - Poverty Level (continued)**

	<b>Not Used</b>				<b>Not at All Helpful</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=391)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=319)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=310)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=391)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=319)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=310)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Electronic networks/discussion groups	45	45	50	51	20	23	19	18
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	24	21	19	23	33	45	33	28

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13F - Poverty Level (continued)**

	<b>Somewhat Helpful</b>				<b>Very Helpful</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=391)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=319)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=310)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=391)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=319)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=310)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Other principals	55	63	57	66	31	23	28	29
Professional principal associations	61	65	54	54	20	16	19	24
Teacher unions or organizations	31	30	33	36	1	3	4	6
Other administrators	63	66	61	61	31	27	29	30
School district	52	55	59	51	38	33	33	38
Intermediate or regional education agency	48	45	44	49	14	13	15	16
State department of education	51	55	59	50	10	10	12	12
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	14	17	26	19	2	0	1	2
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	7	10	14	15	1	0	<1	1
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	10	14	13	13	2	0	<1	3
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	34	33	31	22	4	3	1	5
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	17	16	23	24	1	<1	1	3
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	33	24	29	34	7	8	8	15
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	46*	28*+	46	43	22+	21	13	18
State-developed content standards	53	57	52	50	35	31	33	35
Institutions of higher education	41	53	45	48	12	5	10	13
Professional journals	55	53	58	53	24	17	16	21
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	61	63	61	49	29	24	27	37
Institutes or workshops	60	60	54	55	31	31	39	37



**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13F - Poverty Level (continued)**

	<b>Somewhat Helpful</b>				<b>Very Helpful</b>			
	<b>0-34.9% (N=391)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=319)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=310)</b>	<b>0-34.9% (N=391)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=197)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=319)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=310)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Electronic networks/discussion groups	30	29	28	28	4	2	2	3
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	39	33	44	45	3	1	5	4

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13G - School Size**

	Not Used				Not at All Helpful			
	Less than 300 (N=166)	300-499 (N=286)	500-999 (N=488)	1,000 or more (N=290)	Less than 300 (N=166)	300-499 (N=286)	500-999 (N=488)	1,000 or more (N=290)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Other principals	11	10	8	5	2	1	7	5
Professional principal associations	10	15*+	8	6	15*	6*	12	10
Teacher unions or organizations	31	31	33	24	34	32	36	34
Other administrators	3	4	2	1	5	3	5	4
School district	7	4	2	1	13*+	4	6	7
Intermediate or regional education agency	20	20	25	22	14	15	19	22
State department of education	15	17	17	12	16	18	22	27
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	56	58	63	61	19	21	22	24
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	65	67	71	66	23	19	21	24
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	63	68	66	66	24	18	21	23
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	41	49	47	43	21	19	19	19
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	56	60	62	60	26	18	17	20
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	52	47	45	36	13	15	16	13
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	27	24	26	21	15	10	16	11
State-developed content standards	9	7	3	3	8	4	9	7
Institutions of higher education	26	22	21	18	22	21	24	22
Professional journals	22	15	13	10	10	6	11	9
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	7	5	4	3	6	6	8	8

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13G - School Size (continued)**

	Not Used				Not at All Helpful			
	Less than 300 (N=166)	300-499 (N=286)	500-999 (N=488)	1,000 or more (N=290)	Less than 300 (N=166)	300-499 (N=286)	500-999 (N=488)	1,000 or more (N=290)
Institutes or workshops	<u>%</u> 5	<u>%</u> 5	<u>%</u> 2	<u>%</u> 1	<u>%</u> 5	<u>%</u> 4	<u>%</u> 6	<u>%</u> 8
Electronic networks/discussion groups	54	50	45	35	17	16	24	20
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	21	23	22	24	44	29	34	35

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13G - School Size (continued)**

	Somewhat Helpful				Very Helpful			
	Less than 300 (N=166)	300-499 (N=286)	500-999 (N=488)	1,000 or more (N=290)	Less than 300 (N=166)	300-499 (N=286)	500-999 (N=488)	1,000 or more (N=290)
Other principals	% 59	% 61	% 57	% 58	% 28	% 28	% 28	% 32
Professional principal associations	57	62	58	56	17	17+	22	27*
Teacher unions or organizations	32	34	29	38	3	3	2	4
Other administrators	68	59	63	67	24	34	30	27
School district	53	51	55	58	28*	41	36	33
Intermediate or regional education agency	49	49	44	43	17	15	12	13
State department of education	54	56	51	51	15	9	10	11
U.S. Department of Education's Regional Labs	24	18	15	14	1	3	1	1
U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers	11	13	8	10	<1	1	<1	<1
U.S. Department of Education's Parent Information Resource Centers	13	11	12	11	<1	3	2	<1
U.S. Department of Education's ERIC	33	30	30	37	5	2	3	1
Other U.S. Department of Education offices or programs	17	20	20	19	2	2	1	1
National Science Foundation-funded initiatives (e.g., SSI, USI)	30	29	30	39	5	9	8	11
National model content standards (e.g., NCTM)	42	43	40	51	16	24	19	17
State-developed content standards	54	51	53	60	29	38	35	30
Institutions of higher education	43	44	45	52	8	14	10	8
Professional journals	47	60	55	63	21	19	21	19
State- or district-sponsored education conferences	64	56	59	64	23	34	29	25

**Question 13 (continued)**

**Percentage of principals reporting to what extent selected sources have been helpful in understanding or implementing comprehensive reform, by school characteristics**

**Table 13G - School Size (continued)**

	<b>Somewhat Helpful</b>				<b>Very Helpful</b>			
	<b>Less than 300 (N=166)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=286)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=488)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=290)</b>	<b>Less than 300 (N=166)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=286)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=488)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=290)</b>
Institutes or workshops	<u>%</u> 59	<u>%</u> 55	<u>%</u> 59	<u>%</u> 62	<u>%</u> 31	<u>%</u> 36	<u>%</u> 33	<u>%</u> 29
Electronic networks/discussion groups	25	31	27	41	3	4	4	3
Media (e.g., newspapers, television)	33	43	40	40	2	4	3	2

## Question 14

Percentage of principals reporting their preferred format for information, by school characteristics

**Table 14A - Title I Status**

	<b>All Schools (N=1226)</b>	<b>Non-Title I (N=471)</b>	<b>Title I (N=755)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Hard copy	43	48*	39
Workshops and summer institutes	50	43*	54
Electronic	8	8	8

**Table 14B - School Type**

	<b>Non-Title I Schools (N=471)</b>	<b>SW (N=438)</b>	<b>TA (N=317)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Hard copy	48*	36	41
Workshops and summer institutes	43*	58	50
Electronic	8	7	9

**Table 14C - Minority Enrollment**

	<b>0-49.9% (N=589)</b>	<b>50-79.9% (N=340)</b>	<b>80-100% (N=297)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Hard copy	44	38	44
Workshops and summer institutes	48	54	53
Electronic	8	9	5

**Table 14D - School Level**

	<b>Elementary (N=532)</b>	<b>Middle (N=329)</b>	<b>High (N=307)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Hard copy	42	44	44
Workshops and summer institutes	50	49	47
Electronic	8	7	8

Question 14 (continued)

Percentage of principals reporting their preferred format for information, by school characteristics

**Table 14E - Metropolitan Status**

	<b>Central City Of MSA (N=409)</b>	<b>MSA not Central City (N=341)</b>	<b>Not MSA (N=476)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Hard copy	39	48	42
Workshops and summer institutes	53	44	51
Electronic	9	7	8

**Table 14F - Poverty Level**

	<b>0-34.9% (N=391)</b>	<b>35-49.9% (N=196)</b>	<b>50-74.9% (N=314)</b>	<b>75-100% (N=312)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Hard copy	48	37	38	40
Workshops and summer institutes	44*	56	53	57*
Electronic	8	8	10	5

**Table 14G - School Size**

	<b>Less than 300 (N=164)</b>	<b>300-499 (N=287)</b>	<b>500-999 (N=483)</b>	<b>1,000 or more (N=292)</b>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Hard copy	39	44	44	45
Workshops and summer institutes	53	51	49	40
Electronic	9	5	7	16